Date: Fri, 22 Jan 93 15:11:15 PST
From: Info-Hams Mailing List and Newsgroup <info-hams@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Info-Hams-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Info-Hams Digest V93 #97
To: Info-Hams

Info-Hams Digest Fri, 22 Jan 93 Volume 93 : Issue 97

Today's Topics:

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Info-Hams@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Info-Hams-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Info-Hams Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/info-hams".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: Fri, 22 Jan 1993 19:58:13 GMT
From: stanford.edu!rock!taco!csemail.cropsci.ncsu.edu!samodena@uunet.uu.net
Subject: Carolina Windom
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1076@auratek.UUCP> epacyna@auratek.UUCP (Edward Pacyna) writes:
>I have heard reference to an antenna called the Carolina Windom. I have not
>been able to find any details/description of this antenna. Can someone out

>there provide a short summary/diagram?
>
>Thanks in advance.

The antenna is made and sold by RadioWorks of Virginia (see their ads in
QST, 73, CQ)....send them $1 for their catalog and you will see that the
ad include a diagram of the antenna.

Steve

+---+
| In person: Steve Modena   AB4EL |
| On phone: (919) 515-5328 |
| At e-mail: nmodena@unity.ncsu.edu |
| samodena@csemail.cropsci.ncsu.edu |
| [either email address is read each day] |
| By snail: Crop Sci Dept, Box 7620, NCSU, Raleigh, NC 27695 |
+---+

         Lighten UP! It's just a computer doing that to you.   (c)
OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO

Date: 22 Jan 93 22:18:32 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: Daily Solar Geophysical Data Broadcast for 21 January
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

```
!!BEGIN!! (1.0) S.T.D. Solar Geophysical Data Broadcast for DAY 021, 01/21/93
10.7 FLUX=106.6  90-AVG=141        SSN=069      BKI=1213 1101  BAI=004
BGND-XRAY=B1.3     FLU1=7.0E+04  FLU10=9.6E+03  PKI=2313 2111  PAI=006
  BOU-DEV=007,019,006,025,008,005,002,008   DEV-AVG=010 NT     SWF=00:000
 XRAY-MAX= B2.1   @ 0001UT    XRAY-MIN= B1.2   @ 2203UT   XRAY-AVG= B1.4
NEUTN-MAX= +002%  @ 1835UT   NEUTN-MIN= -004%  @ 0735UT  NEUTN-AVG= -0.2%
  PCA-MAX= +2.2DB @ 2255UT     PCA-MIN= -0.2DB @ 0625UT    PCA-AVG= +0.8DB
BOUTF-MAX=55415NT @ 0630UT   BOUTF-MIN=55391NT @ 1937UT  BOUTF-AVG=55407NT
GOES7-MAX=P:+097NT@ 1904UT   GOES7-MIN=N:+002NT@ 1127UT  G7-AVG=+074,+031,+009
GOES6-MAX=P:+116NT@ 1859UT   GOES6-MIN=E:-007NT@ 2208UT  G6-AVG=+092,+002,+040
 FLUXFCST=STD:105,105,105;SESC:105,105,105 BAI/PAI-FCST=005,005,005/007,007,010
    KFCST=1112 2111 1112 3111  27DAY-AP=006,002   27DAY-KP=0223 2231 0011 1210
 WARNINGS=
   ALERTS=
!!END-DATA!!
```

Date: 22 Jan 93 16:42:16 EST

From: psinntp!arrl.org@uunet.uu.net
Subject: DSP and The Future
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.amateur.misc, wvhorn@magnus.acs.ohio-state.edu (William VanHorne) writes:
>Well folks, I spent part of last Saturday playing with daddy-ham's (W8UOF)
>latest toy: W9GR's DSP box (described in Sept. QST). I'm impressed. I found
[deleted]
>Given the *current* state of DSP technology, why do we need all those reception
>aids? Why do we need multiple IF stages with filtering? For that matter,
>why the heck do we even need to continue to use super-het receivers at all?
>Couldn't we simply go to direct conversion with DSP processed audio?

Yes, but you give up a few things. First, with direct conversion you have no way of separating the 'opposite sideband' signals. That is, a signal 1 kHz below the LO and a signal 1 kHz above the LO are indistinguishable. (There is a way around this--see Rick Campbell's article in January QST--but it presents its own problems.)

A more likely approach is do a conversion--either single or dual, as needed, down to some relatively low IF, like maybe 100 kHz. It's pretty easy to do DSP at that frequency, particularly if you use some simple, cheap filtering to bandlimit the 100-kHz signal to, say a 20 kHz bandwidth.

Of course, it may seem that at this point you've just about built the reciver you were trying to replace, but that's not quite so. Missing from this scheme are: high-cost, phase-distorting crystal filters; all of the multiple mixers and oscillators needed to make the passband tuning/IF shift schemes; detector/demodulator.

In theory, all of the filtering and detection can be done in the DSP. But there's a rub (you knew there would be, right?) In order to maintain an acceptable dynamic range, the DSP system has to do a high-resolution A/D conversion--and calculations to match. I suspect you could get acceptable performance from a 16-bit system for a mid-quality receiver. But a really good receiver would probably need more. Add the fast A/D (note: the D/A doesn't need to be as fast, although fast D/As aren't a problem anyway) to the fast processor needed to do significant DSP, and you have a pretty costly result.

Still, DSP technology is fast moving, and I predict you'll see such receiver technology become standard, and sooner rather than later.

Jon Bloom, KE3Z | jbloom@arrl.org
American Radio Relay League |
225 Main St. |
    Justice is being allowed to do whatever
    I like. Injustice is whatever prevents

Newington, CT 06111 | my doing so. -- Samuel Johnson

Date: 22 Jan 93 22:52:45 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: FT736
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

hi,.
I also have a 736R and use it on the satellite and like it quite a bit. The tracking functions are very handy and pretty intuitive to use. The memory management is a little complicated, but having 100 memories is nice for FM work. There is a simple mod that has been on here before that allows the 736 to tune a little higher and lower in the band, with some special manipulation of the controls - but the range is limited. It doesn't go down to the 136-137 satellite range, and it ends up around 154 - so I haven't bothered yet. But it's as simple as stuffing a diode down a connector to make contact with the pins.

Operating on the Oscar satellites, it's the rig I most often find on the other end. The 'standard' american satellite setup seems to be FT736R, Mirage D1010 amp, and KLM 14C and 44CX antennas. (I use a homebrewed helix on uplink myself).

The receiver is fairly sensitive. I can hear a lot of stuff without a pre-amp, but the S-meter will never get off the pin. I operated most of a year that way until I could get a pre-amp out on the antennna. With an ARR gasfet preamp and a 5 element quagi (horizontal) I managed to copy z8 level in the ZRO test. I think I will need a good audio filter for Z9 :)

I'm told that in hi-rf areas that the receiver can be crunched. I'm lucky and live out in the boonies so that isn't much of a problem. there is a 20 kw FM transmitter about a mile away, but I see no difficulties.

On 440 mhz I hear pretty well with my helix and no preamp. (I don't do as much mode J work, so I haven't invested in the second on the pole preamp). Z5 or so in the ZRO test as I recall.

25 watts is adequate for CW on mode B and J with good antennas and for a lot of phone work. Having 100 watts does help when the squint angle isn't good.

I have had problem with the relays in the power amp and sequencing. When you key the rig, a scope shows that RF is at the output within a millisecond. That is faster than a following RF switched amp can switch, so the transmitter sees an open while the relay flops. That may have killed the 440 transmit module on my first unit. For Oscar work I lock the amp in TX mode and just key the exciter (doesnt bother the receive path because that's on another band). For

FM, I don't run the amp until I build some sort of sequencer.

All in all a good radio. I have fun with mine. :-)

Kevin - WB2EMS
--.

Date: 22 Jan 93 19:03:59 GMT
From: usc!sdd.hp.com!ux1.cso.uiuc.edu!cs.uiuc.edu!vela!wyn386!
danielw@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: IC-32AT, UHF tuning
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I have an ICOM 32-AT handheld. I am very happy with it and use it
regularly. I have modified it to allow UHF receive about the 440-450Mhz
band so as to listen to frequencies in the police/business band at times.
However, our companies frequency allocations are 462.5 and 463.712. Apparently
the tuner unlocks up around that area (I get a U in the memory display which
indicates this).

Does anyone know of a way to tune this receiver to lock onto frequencies just
1-2 Mhz higher than it does (I don't mind losing some on the bottom end of the
UHF spectrum as I don't care to hear anything from 430-440Mhz on this radio.

If anyone can give me some instructions as to how this might be done it would
be greatly appreciated. I know there are hundreds of hams out there who use
these on the net as when I asked for mods I got LOTS of copies. Thank
you for your help.

danielw@wyn386.mi.org

--
Daniel Wynalda | (616) 866-1561 X22 Ham:N8KUD Net:danielw@wyn386.mi.org
Wynalda Litho Inc. | 8221 Graphic Industrial Pk. | Rockford, MI 49341

Date: 22 Jan 93 09:58:12 EST
From: usc!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!pacific.mps.ohio-state.edu!ohstpy!miavx1!
miavx3.mid.muohio.edu!clmorgan@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: illegals (was: Re: Radio Shack Business Band Radio)
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jan21.183435.1083@ryn.mro4.dec.com>, randolph@est.enet.dec.com
(Tom Randolph) writes:
> In article <1993Jan20.125802.2749@vax1.mankato.msus.edu>,

dj1@vax1.mankato.msus.edu writes...
>>>
>>Here is a RS flame but when I was in there the guy said:
>>"No problem, just use it no liscense required!"
>
> Yah, this brings up something I've been wondering about. What are we, as hams,
> to do when something like this occurs?
>
> For instance, here in Massachusetts there is a local for sale/wanted magazine,
> one of the catagories of which is "radios and electronics". I very often see
> ads in there like: Acme 40 channel CB, modified for 100 channels and
>   increased power. Call Joe 123-4567
>
> I'm extremely tempted to tear out the page, apply a highlighter, and forward it
> to the FCC. Comments, anyone?
>
> -Tom R.   randolph@est.enet.dec.com

Go for it ... but ... don't be disappointed when nothing
seems to happen.

I, too, am frustrated by "stuff" like this ... but ... I
guess the wheels of justice gind very slowly. Perhaps,
one of these days, the seller will manage to make a deal
with a radio <enforcement> officer ..... then ?????

73 >< Carl
   K8NHE

Date: Fri, 22 Jan 1993 22:41:56 GMT
From: usc!howland.reston.ans.net!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!pacific.mps.ohio-state.edu!linac!att!cbnews!ameyer@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: KENWOOD TH-78
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In rec.radio.swap, brian@umbc.edu (Brian Cuthie) writes:

> Well, I have one, my girlfriend has one (I gave it to her for Christmas) and
> I know at least five other people with them. It is a way cool rig.
[...]
> One problem I have had with both of the one's I've bought personally, is that
> it seems some of the radios are not tuned properly and appear to have PLL
> lock problems in the AM aircraft band. The symptom is that when the radio is
> tuned to some freq in the aircraft band, the radio beeps pseudo randomly. I'm
> guessing that this otherwise undesirable behavior is a PLL lock alert

> (although, there's nothing in the docs that specifcally suggest that). In
> both cases, I've had to go to the place of purchase and try new radios out
> of the box until I found on that appeared to work.
>
> What's totally inexplicable
> is that I recently got another one with the same problem. When I asked the
> owner of the establishment that sold it to me what he had heard from Kenwood
> about the problem, he said "nothing". So I asked what he had said to
> them about the problem, he said "nothing". So, thinking this was strange,
> I asked what he said was wrong with them when he returned them to Kenwood,
> and he said that he still had them in the back !
                  ^^ ^^^^^ ^^^ ^^^^ ^^ ^^^ ^^^^
> Wierd, since several months had passed since I found the first
> "broken" batch.

What's weird? Instead of sending them back, he's probably going to
sell them to some poor unsuspecting shmoe (who doesn't read netnews).

Who's the dealer, so we can avoid him?

Andy
--
    ==--
  -====---   Andreas Meyer, N2FYE   ahm@hoqas2.att.com
  --==----   AT&T Bell Laboratories, Holmdel NJ   ..!att!hoqas2!ahm
    ----

Date: Fri, 22 Jan 1993 22:08:03 GMT
From: sun-barr!cs.utexas.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!sol.ctr.columbia.edu!
news.columbia.edu!cunixf.cc.columbia.edu!mac20@ames.arpa
Subject: Kenwood TH78 HT quality ?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

I'd pretty familiar with the Yaesu FT-470, and the alinco DJ-580

but what about the Kenwood TH78? how well does it compare with this units?

 how about intermod? etc..etc...

I'm thinking of buying one in the near future and would like any advice
available.

Thanks and 3's
Mike WB2ZLW

****

**** "Of course TV is a medium,   ****
***   It's not rare,   ***
***   And it's certainly not well done." ***

Date: Fri, 22 Jan 1993 18:02:03 GMT
From: adobe!swirsky@decwrl.dec.com
Subject: Marge Simpson's sister is a ham!
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jan22.143403.16112@crd.ge.com> mallick@crd.ge.com writes:
>I don't know how many of you caught "The Simpsons" last night, but during one scene when
>Marge's cigarette-puffing, Gorgon-like sister is lamenting her lonely life and lack of a
>child, she says something like "I still have my ham radio". The picture shifts to a radio
>with a zillion knobs with some foreign-sounding voice coming out of the speaker; the
>translation sub-title said "I have a ham radio."
>
>Is this ARRL-approved advertising? :-)
>

I enjoyed seeing her radio.

The only other Ham Radio reference I've ever seen on a television sitcom was an episode of Hazel. It went like this:

> The kid in the Hazel household (I forget his name after 20 years) befriends a new neighbor who is an amateur radio operator. Shortly after, everyone in the house starts experiencing TVI.
>
> The new neighbor ham is blamed for the TVI and a feud starts.
>
> Eventually, the ham traces the cause of interference to an electric blanket (!) in Hazel's house, and everyone apoliges to each other.

---
73 & 88
Robert A. Swirsky AF2M
"Another EXTRA for NO-CODE!"

Date: 22 Jan 93 16:36:04 GMT

From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: NEED HELP FINDING OLD CALLSIGN
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

levin@bbn.com (Joel B Levin) said:
>In <1993Jan22.135838.15824@cbnewse.cb.att.com>
> parnass@cbnewse.cb.att.com (Bob Parnass, AJ9S) said:
>|Also, some people *incorrectly* assume that you can tell how
>|long a ham has been licensed from the data on these servers.
>
>True, but you do get an upper bound!
>
>   /JBL

Umm... maybe we're just defining terms differently here, but don't you mean a LOWER bound? If you're referring to the dates, they only tell you the last time some action was taken on the license (upgrade, change of address, etc.) So the person has obviously been licensed at least since that date.

If you're referring to the callsigns (including previous callsign), that tells you absolutely nothing. Only one previous callsign (at most) seems to be kept in the records, so if I was W1AAA licensed in 1927 (just an example) and then I moved to PA and got the call N3BUG, and then moved to MA and got the call N1HOG, I think the database would only show N1HOG and N3BUG. Thus you could tell nothing from the callsigns. Someone correct me if this is wrong, but I know my father has had more than two calls and only two show up in the database.

73,
Keith (WA2Q)

keith@radio.nusc.navy.mil

Date: 22 Jan 93 20:28:38 GMT
From: olivea!sgigate!odin!chuck.dallas.sgi.com!adams@ames.arpa
Subject: OHR QRP followup [short - maybe]
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Gang,

just a quick followup to the net and i'll get off this topic.

the OHR QRP Spirit rig is doing great. set it for two watts out
on 40 meters (four watts was too easy). in two nights i have worked:

TX, OK, CA, FL, NY, MO, NC, NJ, OH, MD, AZ (let's see 11 down 39 to go)

VE6, XE1, CM2, and YN1 (Venzuela)... 5 down (USA counts) 320+ to go

YN1, caracas, venz. is 3976 miles/2 watts = 1,988 miles per watt

QSK on this rig great, selectivity great and sensitivity great.

BTW, above qso's except YN1 were not quick exchanges, but qso's of 15 to
45 minutes at 20 to 50 wpm. most at 20-25 wpm. one at 13 wpm. i clock this
junk in my logbook just for the heck of it. :-) i do QRS. i don't need the
practice.

rig on 80 mtr long wire up 10 mtrs. 450 ohm twin plastic ladder line
end fed with mfj 941c tuner (you should here it arc when i forget to
short input to ground and storm comes up ;-0 !! ;-( )
this wire tunes from 160-10mtrs with 1:1 swr with mfj tuner. not that the
tuner is that great, it's just the way it is. 450 ohm line is about 70 ft
through attic and ceiling in closet. no arcing to wood with 5watts or less ;-)

either rig and antenna is doing good job or i'm just a hot operator. ;-)
you don't see me in the QST listings do you? tried SS with 25 watts and
dipole ONCE. i am educated beyond my intelligence now. :-)

thanks for the email guys.

still a satisified customer. any questions to adams@sgi.com

de k5fo chuck   CP-60   was 40 cw qrp, DXCC 40cw in progress (5 and counting)

my opinions only.....

Date: 22 Jan 93 20:40:03 GMT
From: news-mail-gateway@ucsd.edu
Subject: The state of Ham Radio
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

...
>We hams didn't have much of a plan either or we would not have lost it. Use
>it or lose it! With the recent thread on 70 cm close repeaters in mind how
>many of us are watching out for our microwave bands? I hope we don't expect
>the ARRL to come to our rescue. No slight of the ARRL intended here. Seems
>too many hams have the attitude that "the League will save it for us" instead
>adding our voices to the Leagues. Bet the FCC got more comments about the
>no code proposal than the lose to 220-222. <sigh>
>
>   Bob

>--
> Bob Billson, KC2WZ | internet: bob@kc2wz.bubble.org
> $nail: 21 Bates Way, Westfield, NJ 07090 | uucp: ...!uunet!kc2wz!bob

See also section B front page USA Today 1/21 and other papers about testimony by John Scully (sp?) and others to congressional committee regarding two issues: 1. Deregulation of phone companies (which we probably don't care about). 2. Reallocation of spectrum space for new uses. Item 2 is ominous. A few other people (Phil Karn, Gary from Atlanta and Julian from Bongo come to mind) have made valid points about where we appear to be putting our attention as opposed to where we should be putting our attention. Ham radio is extremely vulnerable from a technical perspective. We are nowhere near "state of the art" to the extent we should be. From a political (taken broadly) perspective we still have a lot of good will although the desire of some to be policemen for the spectrum as well as the level of some of the discussions we have here and more particularly on the air is hurting us. In addition, 911 on a cellular phone is becomming the way many emergency situations are being reported, cutting into our favorable press. Regardless of your point of view, the 10+ year long code/no-code feud has probably irreparably hurt us with a major portion of our potential constituency and may have cost us much of a generation of computer literate, technologically savvy hams. Each of the new consumer/wireless communications schemes which comes along will want a chunk of spectrum about the size of a ham band. I am afraid the UPS 220MHz scheme may ultimately come to look like a kindergarden playground skirmish. Is anyone else concerned about all this?

     Jack K4FRS
     buchanan@bme1.utmem.edu

Date: 22 Jan 1993 22:52:24 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!col.hp.com!kenw@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Through-the-glass antennas
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

Well...

I've been using the Larson 2/70 for nearly a year without a problem. I followed the instructions to the letter, but I was worried that the ambient temperature at the time (30 degrees) might affect the joint quality. No problems, though!

Seems to receive just fine, too!

Ken Wyatt (kenw@col.hp.com)

Date: 22 Jan 93 09:53:05 EST
From: news.acns.nwu.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!pacific.mps.ohio-state.edu!
ohstpy!miavx1!miavx3.mid.muohio.edu!clmorgan@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Through-the-glass antennas?
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jan21.152449.5163@mixcom.com>, kevin.jessup
<kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes:
> Still waiting for my license and have an antennea question...

Congrats! You've already taken that first, important step. Here's to many fun experiences on the ham bands.

> I have one of those "through-the-glass" cellular lookalike
> scanner antennas that I got from Radio Shack for use with my
> Uniden scanner.
>
> How will this thing work with an HT at around 5 watts or less?
> Too much SWR?

I'd guess not ... but ... it's worth a try with a VSWR meter. Use the lowest output power available from the HT. Better to find a more sensitive meter than to up the output while testing. [Also, low power reduces innecessary interference.]

> I've got the latest AES catalog and they have HT through the glass
> antennas but they also have a tuning/matching adjustment on them.

I've been using an Antenna Specialists on-glass for about 6 months on my XYL's new car. Seems to work very well. It does have a tuning "box" on the inside of the window.

> I'd rather not use these things if there not that good.

My choice is a 1/4-wave mounted in the roof. My car has just such a gizmo ... 3/4" hole in the roof as well. I believe the 1/4-wave (which is only 19" long) works as well (maybe a little better) than the on-glass (that is 34" long).

My son has been using an on-glass (Camaro) for nearly 3 years. He is quite satisfied ... but since he's never had anything else, `tis hard to be objective. His antenna is an old one ... circa

1980 and made by Avanti (now part of Antenna Specialists). It measures in at 31". Yes, it does have the matching section inside the car.

A friend has the cellular look-alike. He doesn't swear by it ... he SWEARS AT IT!! Undoubtedly the poorest antenna we've ever evaluated. But, his XYL liked the looks of it!

> Even worse, could these types of antennas damage my HT??

Could, if the VSWR is high and you insist on using it.

> I sure don't want to fry the output stages of my new DJ-580T!!

That's reasonable.

> --
> Kevin Jessup, kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com
>
> "Friends don't let friends run DOS."
> -- Microware

Good luck ... and .... welcome, again, to the hobby.

73 >< Carl
K8NHE

Date: 22 Jan 93 22:22:00 GMT
From: news.acns.nwu.edu!zaphod.mps.ohio-state.edu!ub!acsu.buffalo.edu!ubvmsb.cc.buffalo.edu!v111qheg@network.UCSD.EDU
Subject: Writing out -.-. .-- to pass your exam
To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

While it is legal to do it, I think it would be extremely hard to do this at 20 wpm :-)

73,
KB2NMV

Date: 22 Jan 1993 22:43:19 GMT
From: sdd.hp.com!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!oak!laborde@network.UCSD.EDU

To: info-hams@ucsd.edu

References <HIDEG.93Jan19185621@spsd630a.erim.org>, <727569774snx@skyld.tele.com>,
<HIDEG.93Jan21140723@spsd630a.erim.org>
Subject : Re: HTs at Disneyland

With the proliferation of these tiny (tinny?) cellular phones, how is it possible for anyone to even tell if the antenna sticking out of your pocket is a "radio?" Couldn't it be a cellphone, or a walkman, or a watchman, or something like that? Does Mickey have the right to strip-search you before allowing you to enter the Magic Kingdom?

-grl.

End of Info-Hams Digest V93 #97
****